

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Title

The Office Action alleges that the title of the application is not descriptive. A new title has been provided that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the title be withdrawn.

Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification due to the lack of a section identifying co-pending applications. Applicant has amended the specification to include a section entitled "Related Applications" to overcome this objection.

Additionally, the Office Action alleges that, beginning on page 23, the application contains a computer program listing (or pseudo code) and requires Applicant to reposition the computer program listing onto a Compact Disc. The Office Action is referring to the description of the System.Web namespace, which is not a computer program listing nor pseudo code. Instead, the System.Web namespace contains classes and interfaces that, for example, enable browser/server communication. This description of the System.Web namespace contained in the application is not a computer program listing and is not pseudo code. The System.Web namespace description contained in the application is not executable

code and cannot be compiled into executable code. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the positioning of the description of the System.Web namespace in the application is proper.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Abstract

The Office Action objects to the Abstract. Applicant has amended the Abstract herein. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action requests that the Applicant provide known prior art.

In response to this request, the Examiner is directed to the Information Disclosure Statement filed January 14, 2004, in the present application. Additionally, the Examiner is directed to the Information Disclosure Statement filed herewith. Applicant notes that copies of the patent applications cited in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted herewith have not been included due to the large size of each patent application and the burden associated with copying and submitting the large patent applications. If this is not acceptable to the Examiner, Applicant will provide printed copies of the patent applications upon request.

Applicant respectfully submits that these Information Disclosure Statements satisfy the Office Action's request for prior art.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 24-26 due to an incorrect preamble. Applicant has amended claims 24-26 as suggested in the Office Action.

35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action alleges that certain terms or phrases used in the claims render specific claims indefinite.

Applicant has amended some of the claims above to clarify the language of the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that current claim language adequately points out the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. For example, Applicant submits that terms “HTTP output”, “output cache”, “web services”, “web method attribute class”, “HTML controls”, “web controls” and the like do not render the claims indefinite. Applicant notes that the allegedly indefinite terms are used throughout the specification. Applicant submits that using terms in the claims that are also used in the specification is proper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim language, as amended, adequately points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §112, Second Paragraph rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 8-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Deitel et al. Java How To Program Book, Third Edition, 1999, Pages 7-29, 698-699, 714-717, 876-878, 936-977, 980-998 and 1002-1046 (hereinafter "Deitel"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 and 8-31 are not anticipated by Deitel.

Deitel provides various information regarding developing programs using the Java programming language. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 of the present application is not anticipated by Deitel. Claim 1 of the present application recites:

An application program interface embodied on one or more computer readable media, comprising:

a first class to provide information regarding a current HTTP request;

a second class to manage HTTP output to a client; and

an object to provide access to server-side utilities and processes.

The Deitel reference fails to disclose "a second class to manage HTTP output to a client" as recited in claim 1. The Office Action alleges support for this portion of claim 1 at chapter 19, page 936 of Deitel. See paragraph 20 of Office Action. The cited page (page 936) of Deitel discusses introductory information regarding servlets. This first page of chapter 19 fails to disclose a second class to manage HTTP output to a client. Further, applicant submits that the entire chapter 19 fails to disclose a second class to manage HTTP output to a client.

The Office Action specifically mentions “subclasses of Servlets” in rejecting claim 1. Applicant assumes that the Office Action is referring to section 19.2 of Deitel (pages 938-942). Section 19.2 of Deitel discusses an HTTPServlet class as well as HTTP “Get” and “Post” requests. However, the disclosure in section 19.2 of Deitel fails to mention any class that manages HTTP output to a client, as recited in claim 1. Applicant has reviewed the remainder of chapter 19 of Deitel and fails to see any disclosure of a class that manages HTTP output to a client, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that Deitel fails to disclose all elements of claim 1.

As such, applicant submits that claim 1 of the present application is not anticipated by Deitel. Given that claims 2-6 and 8-14 depend from claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Deitel for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 15, as amended, recites:

An application program interface embodied on one or more computer readable media, comprising:

a first group of services related to information associated with a current HTTP request;

a second group of services related to managing HTTP output to a client;

a third group of services related to accessing server-based utilities;
and

a fourth group of services related to creating web services.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Deitel fails to disclose a class to manage HTTP output from a client. Similarly, Applicant submits that the

Deitel reference fails to disclose “a second group of services related to managing HTTP output to a client”, as recited in claim 15. Although Deitel mentions HTTP “Get” and “Post” requests, Deitel fails to mention a group of services related to managing HTTP output to a client. Therefore, Applicant submits that Deitel fails to disclose all elements of claim 15.

As such, applicant submits that claim 15 of the present application is not anticipated by Deitel. Given that claims 16-21 depend from claim 15, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Deitel for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 15.

Claim 22, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:
creating an HTTP request class to provide information regarding a current HTTP request;
creating an HTTP response class to manage an HTTP output stream to a client; and
creating an HTTP server utility object to provide access to server-based utilities.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Deitel fails to disclose a class to manage HTTP output from a client. Similarly, Applicant submits that the Deitel reference fails to disclose “creating an HTTP response class to manage an HTTP output stream to a client”, as recited in claim 22. Although Deitel mentions the use of HTTP “Get” and “Post” requests, Deitel does not mention creation of an HTTP response class to manage an HTTP output stream to a client. Therefore, Applicant submits that Deitel fails to disclose all elements of claim 22.

As such, applicant submits that claim 22 of the present application is not anticipated by Deitel. Given that claims 23-26 depend from claim 22, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Deitel for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 22.

Claim 27, as amended, recites:

A computer system including one or more microprocessors and one or more software programs, the one or more software programs utilizing an application program interface to request services from an operating system, the application program interface including separate commands to request services consisting of the following groups of services:

- a first group of services related to information regarding a current HTTP request;

- a second group of services related to managing HTTP output to a client;

- a third group of services related to providing access to server-based utilities; and

- a fourth group of services related to creating web services.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Deitel fails to disclose a class to manage HTTP output from a client. Similarly, Applicant submits that the Deitel reference fails to disclose “a second group of services related to managing HTTP output to a client”, as recited in claim 27. Although Deitel mentions the use of HTTP “Get” and “Post” requests, Deitel does not disclose a group of services related to managing HTTP output to a client. Therefore, Applicant submits that Deitel fails to disclose all elements of claim 27. As such, applicant submits that claim 27 of the present application is not anticipated by Deitel.

Claim 28, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:
calling one or more first functions to facilitate providing information related to a current HTTP request;
calling one or more second functions to facilitate managing HTTP output to a client;
calling one or more third functions to facilitate access to server-based utilities and processes; and
calling one or more fourth functions to facilitate creating a user interface on a web page.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Deitel fails to disclose a class to manage HTTP output from a client. Similarly, Applicant submits that the Deitel reference fails to disclose “calling one or more second functions to facilitate managing HTTP output to a client”, as recited in claim 28. Although Deitel mentions the use of HTTP “Get” and “Post” requests, the Deitel reference does not disclose calling one or more second functions to facilitate managing HTTP output to a client. Therefore, Applicant submits that Deitel fails to disclose all elements of claim 28.

As such, applicant submits that claim 28 of the present application is not anticipated by Deitel. Given that claims 29-31 depend from claim 28, applicant respectfully submits that those claims are likewise allowable over Deitel for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 28.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitel in view of “Official Notice”. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is patentable over Deitel in view of “Official Notice”.

As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Deitel fails to disclose a class to manage HTTP output from a client. The Office Action’s “Official Notice” fails to disclose this missing element of claim 1. Further nothing in Deitel suggests a class to manage HTTP output from a client. Since claim 7 depends from claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable over Deitel in view of “Official Notice”.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

New Claims


Applicant submits that new claims 32-33 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 6-30-04

By: 
Steven R. Sponseller
Reg. No. 39,384
(509) 324-9256